

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated May 4, 2007 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and objected to claim 9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claim. The Amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 1 claims a thin-film magnetic head comprising an insulation gap, a U-shaped yoke, at least one coil conductor, and at least one conductive metal layer. The U-shaped yoke has first and second magnetic poles separated from each other by the insulation gap. The at least one coil conductor is wound around the yoke by a plurality of turns. The at least one conductive metal layer is arranged near the at least one coil conductor in parallel with a plane of the at least one coil conductor. The at least one conductive metal layer produces current flowing therethrough. The current is induced by alternating current flowing through the at least one coil conductor.

Through the structure of the claimed invention having a U-shaped yoke and having at least one coil conductor wound around the yoke, as claimed in claim 1, the claimed invention provides a thin-film magnetic head in which the inductance of the coil conductor can be reduced while keeping a shape and size of the coil conductor. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 1.

Claims 1-6, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Narushige et al.* (JP56-156914).

Narushige et al. appears to disclose in Fig. 3 a metal film 6 arranged between a lower magnetic material 11 and an upper magnetic material 12. A conductor film 13 functions as a

coil. Insulator 17A is formed between the lower magnetic material 11 and the coil 13. Insulator 17B is formed between the coil 13 and the metal film 16. Insulator 17C is formed between the upper magnetic material 12 and the metal layer 16.

Thus, *Narushige et al.* merely discloses a conductive metal layer 16 formed above a coil conductor 13. Nothing in *Narushige et al.* shows, teaches or suggests (a) a U-shaped yoke having first and second magnetic poles separated from each other by an insulation gap and (b) at least one coil conductor wound around the U-shaped yoke by a plurality of turns as claimed in claim 1. Rather, *Narushige et al.* only discloses a coil conductor 13 formed beneath metal layer 16.

Since nothing in *Narushige et al.* shows, teaches or suggests (a) a U-shaped yoke having first and second magnetic poles separated from each other by an insulation gap and (b) at least one coil conductor wound around the U-shaped yoke by a plurality of turns as claimed in claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 2-6, 10 and 11 recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-6, 10 and 11 will not have been anticipated by *Narushige et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1-6, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Narushige et al.*

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be

set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in *Narushige et al.* show, teach or suggest the primary features as claimed in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims would not be obvious over *Narushige et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Since objected to claim 9 depends from an allowable claim, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the objection thereto.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
Tel. (202) 292-1530

Date: September 4, 2007